

# STATE BUILDING CODE COUNCIL

# Washington State Energy Code Development Standard Energy Code Proposal Form

May 2018

Log No. <u>21-GP1-126 TAG Revision</u> 06/04/21

Code being amended:	Commercial Provisions	Residential Provisions					
Code Section # C405.2							

Moves LLLC control function to standalone section, rewords a few things, fixes section reference, and adds requirement for high-end trim.

Proposed code change text: (Copy the existing text from the Integrated Draft, linked above, and then use <u>underline</u> for new text and <del>strikeout</del> for text to be deleted.)

**C405.2 Lighting controls.** Lighting systems shall be provided with controls that comply with one of the following:

- 1. Lighting controls as specified in Sections C405.2.1 through C405.2.9.
- 2.1...2. Luminaire level lighting controls (LLLC) as specified in Section C405.2.10. and lighting controls as specified in Sections C405.2.1, C405.2.3 and C405.2.6. The LLLC luminaire shall be independently configured to:
- 3.1. Monitor occupant activity to brighten or dim lighting when occupied or unoccupied, respectively.
- 4.1. Monitor ambient light, both electric and daylight, and brighten or dim artificial light to maintain desired light level.
- 5.1. For each control strategy, configuration and re-configuration of performance parameters including: bright and dim set points, timeouts, dimming fade rates, sensor sensitivity adjustments, and wireless zoning configuration.

<u>C405.2.10 Luminaire level lighting controls.</u> Where luminaire level lighting controls are required they shall be configured to provide the controls or equivalent control function and lighting controls as specified in Sections C405.2.1, C405.2.3 and C405.2.65. In addition, each The LLLC luminaire shall be independently configured to:

- 1.1. Monitor occupant activity to brighten or dim lighting when occupied or unoccupied, respectively.
- 1.2. Monitor ambient light, both electric and daylight, and brighten or dim artificial light to maintain desired light level.
- 1.3. For each control strategy, Allow configuration and re-configuration of performance parameters for each control strategy including: bright and dim set points, timeouts, dimming fade rates, sensor sensitivity adjustments, and wireless zoning configuration.

<u>C405.2.10.1 High-end trim</u>. The maximum bright setpoint of each LLLC <u>lumininaire</u> shall be adjusted to deliver the <u>required</u>target/<u>design</u> light with the least amount of power.

#### Purpose of code change:

**Brief Description:** 

Achieve energy savings from advanced lighting control

Your amendment m	ust meet one of the fo	ollowing criteria. Sele	ct at least one:				
Addresses a criti	cal life/safety need.		Consistency with state or federal regulations.				
The amendment clarifies the intent or application of the code.			Addresses a unique character of the state.  Corrects errors and omissions.				
	cific state policy or sta cy conservation is a sta						
Check the building types that would be impacted by your code change:							
☐ Single family/duplex/townhome ☐ Multi-family 4		stories					
☐ Multi-family 1 – 3 stories		Commercial / Retail		☐ Industrial			
Your name	Mike Kennedy		Email address	mikekennedy@energysims.com			
Your organization	Mike Kennedy, Inc		Phone number	3603010098			
Other contact name	Louis Starr						
	his form as an email a for further information	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•				

## **Economic Impact Data Sheet**

Briefly summarize your proposal's primary economic impacts and benefits to building owners, tenants and businesses.

The requirement to conduct high-end trim in this proposal will increase installation costs to the owners and deliver significant energy savings. Since this is an alternate path that generally costs more than standard controls the impact will be no cost change and no savings. For those utilizing this path, high-end trim is most likely being done. Still a cost benefit for the new requirement is completed here.

Provide your best estimate of the construction cost (or cost savings) of your code change proposal? (See OFM Life Cycle Cost Analysis tool and Instructions; use these Inputs. Webinars on the tool can be found Here and Here)

\$0/square foot (For residential projects, also provide \$0/ dwelling unit)

Show calculations here, and list sources for costs/savings, or attach backup data pages

Task tuning was estimated at \$0.03/sf to \$0.06/sf by the Minnesota Department of Commerce. The high end of this estimate is used. Assuming 80ft<sup>2</sup> per fixture high-end trim/task tuning costs \$4.80 per fixture plus tax - \$5.28.

Adjusting lighting levels in commercial buildings: Energy savings from institutional tuning. 2015. Minnesota Department of Commerce, Division of Energy Resources.

Provide your best estimate of the annual energy savings (or additional energy use) for your code change proposal?

### 12.5 kWh/year per fixture

Savings have been found to be ~ 25% when comparing building with network lighting controls with LLLC which reflects the savings from having individual controls on each fixture. High-end trim (task tuning) has been shown to save 27% in the same study. These are not 100% additive but do combine to some extent. Assuming a 40watt fixture, 2500 hours/ year operation, and 25% savings yields a savings of 25 kWh/year. Assuming trim savings in new construction are drastically less results in 12.5 kWh/year

Energy Savings from Networked Lighting Control Systems With and Without Luminaire Level Lighting Controls. Table 2. October 6, 2020. Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance.

#### **OFM Calculator Summary**

Life Cycle Cost Analysis			BEST		
Alternative	Baseline		Alt. 1	Alt. 2	
Energy Use Intenstity (kBtu/sq.ft)	#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	
1st Construction Costs	\$	-	\$ 5	\$	-
PV of Capital Costs	\$	-	\$ 13	\$	-
PV of Maintenance Costs	\$	-	\$ =	\$	-
PV of Utility Costs	\$	334	\$ 292	\$	334
Total Life Cycle Cost (LCC)	\$	334	\$ 305	\$	334
Net Present Savings (NPS)	N/A		\$ 29	\$	-

Societal LCC takes into consideration the social cost of carbon dioxide emissions caused by operational energy consumption

(GHG) Social Life Cycle Cost	BEST							
GHG Impact from Utility Consumption		Baseline			Alt. 1		Alt. 2	
Tons of CO2e over Study Period			2		2			2
% CO2e Reduction vs. Baseline		N/A			13%			0%
Present Social Cost of Carbon (SCC)	\$		131	\$	114	\$	1	131
Total LCC with SCC	\$		464	\$	419	\$	4	464
NPS with SCC		N/A		\$	45	\$		-

